

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JAN 16 2007**Serial No. 10/379,258
Attorney Docket No. 47270.0117**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended in an interview conducted January 16, 2007. Applicants reply to the Office Action mailed on October 17, 2006. Applicant addresses the Examiner's remarks. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time the inventions covered therein were made and therefore, Applicants have complied with 37 C.F.R. § 1.56.

Claim Rejections under §103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vieira (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,367 B2) in view of O'Neil (U.S. Patent No. 4,739,928). Claims 1-3 and 5 further stand rejected as being unpatentable over Vieira in view of O'Neil and Weyl (U.S. Patent No. 2,022,394). As discussed during the interview and as detailed below, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as set forth below.

Vieira discloses, generally, a dual reservoir evaporation device having an electric heating element associated with wicks extending from each reservoir. O'Neil discloses an air freshener having a single wick and a single emanator pad. Weyl discloses a humidifier that employs wicks in reservoirs having a valve for controlling reservoir fluid levels.

As recognized in the Office Action, Vieira fails to teach an evaporation region comprising a pad in liquid communication with the first and second wick structures. Nor is this deficiency cured by a single evaporative pad supplied by a single wick as taught by O'Neil.

To the contrary, as discussed in the interview, the combination of Vieira and O'Neil would yield at most a device having two pads separately associated with separate wicks. Accordingly, neither Vieira, O'Neil, Weyl, nor any combination thereof discloses or suggests at least an "evaporation region comprising a pad in liquid communication with said first wick structure and said second wick structure" as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Similarly, claims 2-3 and 5 variously depend from claim 1 and contain all of the elements thereof. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are differentiated from the cited reference at least for the same reasons as set forth above, in addition to their own respective

Serial No. 10/379,258

Attorney Docket No. 47270.0117

features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, and 5.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

CONCLUSION

JAN 16 2007

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims 1-3 and 5 (4 total, 1 independent) are in condition for allowance. No new matter is added in this Reply. Reconsideration of the application is thus requested. **The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2814.** Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1-16-07By: Kirk Dorius
Kirk Dorius
Reg. No. 54,073

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 East Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
Telephone: (602) 382-6544
Facsimile: (602) 382-6070
E-mail: kdorius@swlaw.com